

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05946 251901Z

40

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-04 ACDA-05 ISO-00 EURE-00 CIAE-00 PM-03

INR-05 L-01 NSAE-00 PA-01 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 DODE-00 NSC-05 CU-02 /050 W

----- 126126

P 251630Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8415

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4542

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 5946

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO, UR

SUBJECT: NATO/IS WORKING PAPER ON CSCE/MBFR LINKAGE

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

MOSCOW PASS COUNSELOR SONNENFELDT AND ASSISTANT SECREATRY HARTMAN

MISSION TRANSMITS BELOW TEXT OF NATO/IS WORKING PAPER ON CSCE/MBFR
REVERSE LINKAGE DISCUSSED IN SPC OCTOBER 24 (SEPTEL.

BEGIN TEXT.

AT THE COUNCIL MEETING ON 2ND OCTOBER, THE ACTING
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES RASIED THE POSSI-
BILITY OF TURNING THE TABLES ON THE SOVIET UNION WHICH WAS SEEKING
TO LINK MBFR AND CSCE BY ESTABLISHING SUCH A LINK OURSELVES MAKING
PROGRESS IN CSCE CONTINGENT UPON EASTERN MOVEMENT IN MBFR.

2. AS AGREED BY THE COUNCIL ON THAT OCCASION, THE SENIOR
POLITICAL COMMITTEE HAS DISCUSSED THE SUBJECT WITH A VIEW TO
CLARIFYING THE ISSUES INVOLVED BEFORE FURTHER DEBATE IN COUNCIL.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05946 251901Z

3. THE UNITED STATES INITIATIVE IN PROPOSING THAT THE
MATTER SHOULD BE DISCUSSED WAS GENERALLY WELCOMED BY THE SENIOR
POLITICAL COMMITTEE, THOUGH THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE STRESSED
THAT THERE WAS NO CHANGE IN THE FUNDAMENTAL POSITION OF HIS GOVERN-

MENT ON THE QUESTION OF ANY LINK BETWEEN MBFR AND CSCE. THE MAIN POINTS OF SUBSTANCE WHICH AROSE IN THE DISCUSSION ARE REFLECTED BELOW.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO SETS OF NEGOTIATIONS

4. ALTHOUGH INTER-RELATED HISTORICALLY, CSCE AND MBFR ARE CHARACTERIZED BY CERTAIN BASIC DIFFERENCES WHICH COMPLICATE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LINK:

(A) THE DIFFERENCE IN THE TIME SCALES. CSCE APPEARS CERTAIN TO END LONG BEFORE MBFR. THIS RAISES THE PROBLEM OF HOW TO GUARANTEE THAT THE SOVIET UNION WOULD IN THE EVENT RESPECT ANY AGREEMENT TO PAY A PRICE IN MBFR FOR PROGRESS IN CSCE;

(B) THE DIFFERENCE IN PARTICIPATION BETWEEN THE TWO NEGOTIATIONS; MBFR IS CONFINED TO NATO AND WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES AND IS BLOC-TO-BLOC, WHILE CSCE INCLUDES NEUTRAL COUNTRIES. THIS RAISES THE PROBLEM THAT LINKAGE COULD OFFEND CERTAIN OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE CSCE AND ALIENATE THEM FROM THE SIDE OF THE ALLIED GOVERNMENTS.

DEFINITION OF AIMS

5. IN ORDER TO GIVE EFFECT TO LINKAGE, THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO AGREE ON PRECISELY WHAT PROPOSALS THEY WERE PREPARED TO MAKE IN THE CSCE AND WHAT PRICE THEY WOULD SEEK IN RETURN IN VIENNA. IT WAS DIFFICULT TO SEE HOW AN OFFER TO SPEED UP THE NEGOTIATIONS IN GENEVA COULD BE MADE REALISTICALLY WITHOUT BEING ACCOMPANIED BY AN OFFER OF CONCESSIONS. IT WAS NOT ALLIED DELEGATIONS WHO WERE SLOWING DOWN CSCE.

RELATIVE POSITIONS OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE ALLIED COUNTRIES IN THE TWO NEGOTIATIONS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05946 251901Z

6. THE SOVIET UNION WAS SEEKING TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE FACT THAT THE ALLIED COUNTRIES WERE THE DEMANDEURS IN MBFR. BY CONTRAST, THE SOVIET UNION WAS MUCH LESS IN THE POSITION OF DEMANDEUR IN CSCE, PARTICULARLY NOW THAT IT HAD ACHIEVED ITS MAIN AIM IN BASKET I. THE REMAINING MAJOR OBJECTIVE OF THE SOVIETS IN CSCE APPEARED TO BE THE HOLDING OF A FINAL PHASE AT SUMMIT LEVEL. HOW MUCH OF A PRICE THEY WOULD BE PREPARED TO PAY FOR THIS WAS NOT, HOWEVER, CLEAR.

ALLIANCE COHESION

7. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A LINK COULD PLACE HEAVY STRAIN ON ALLIANCE COHESION AND GIVE THE SOVIET UNION THE OPPORTUNITY TO DRIVE WEDGES. IT WOULD BE ESSENTIAL TO ENSURE THAT THIS SHOULD

NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAPPEN. IT WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR THE UNITED STATES TO PLAY A MAJOR ROLE IN ESTABLISHING AND ENSURING THE EFFECTIVE WORKING OF ANY LINK.

PROCEDURAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. THERE WAS A NEED FOR VERY CAREFUL EXPLORATION OF THE POSITION IF THE IDEA OF LINKAGE WAS TO BE PURSUED. FORTHCOMING BILATERAL MEETINGS WITH THE SOVIETS COULD PROVIDE A SUITABLE OPPORTUNITY FOR THIS.

GENERAL

9. A SUCCESSFUL AND SATISFACTORY LINK COULD BOTH ADVANCE THE NEOGITATIONS IN MBFR AND HELP TOWARDS AN EARLIER CONCLUSION OF THE CSCE, THOUGH THIS WOULD HAVE TO BE ON ACCEPTABLE TERMS. THERE WERE, HOWEVER, MAJOR PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES, IN PARTICULAR THAT OF DETERMINING JUST WHAT SHOULD BE PLACED ON EACH SIDE OF THE EQUATION. THERE WERE ALSO DANGERS THAT LINKAGE COULD LEAD TO DEADLOCK, DAMAGE TO THE PROCESS OF DETENTE, STRAINS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE AND DIVISIONS BETWEEN THE ALLIANCE COUNTRIES AND THE NEUTRALS IN GENEVA.

END TEXT.
MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO05946
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryybv.tel
Line Count: 135
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <23 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO/IS WORKING PAPER ON CSCE/MBFR LINKAGE
TAGS: PFOR, NATO, UR
To: STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
MOSCOW
MBFR VIENNA
GENEVA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005